UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,634	10/24/2003	Daniel P. Brown	CS21907RA	8650

20280 7590 07/03/2006

MOTOROLA INC
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45
ROOM AS437
LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343

EXAMINER	
HUANG, WEN WU	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2618	

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/692,634	BROWN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wen W. Huang	2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 April 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/10/06 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 13-20 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Monroe (US PUB NO 2003/0227540 A1).

Regarding **claim 13**, Monroe teaches a method of a central authority (see Monroe, fig. 3; "guard station #1") for receiving information about an incident from at least one remote device, the method comprising:

receiving, from a remote device (see Monroe, fig. 21A, component 300), incident information associated with an incident event (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 9-17), the incident information having been obtained by at least one video sensor of the remote device (see Monroe, fig. 21C, component 346);

comparing the incident information to previously received information (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 25-27) to identify at least one portion of the previously received information that relates to the incident information (see Monroe, para. [0020], lines 10-14), the at least one portion including information received from a device other than the remote device (see Monroe, fig. 21a, component 302); and

correlating the incident information (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 21-22) with the at least one portion of the previously received information that relates to the incident information (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 13-17; the response personnel correlates the live video information with audio information received from the caller or the archived audio/video)

Regarding **claim 14**, Monroe also teaches the method of claim 13, further comprising:

determine whether other information sources are available (see Monroe, para. [0020], lines 14-19); and

request information from the other information sources that are available (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 11-13).

Regarding **claim 15**, Monroe also teaches the method of claim 13, further comprising reconstructing the incident event based on the incident information and the at least one portion of the previously received information that relates to the incident information (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 21-27).

Regarding **claim 16**, Monroe also teaches the method of claim 13, further comprising:

identify other devices that may become affected by the incident event (see Monroe, para. [0020], lines 10-14); and

alert any devices that may become affected by the incident event (see Monroe, para. [0020], lines 14-19).

Regarding **claim 17**, Monroe teaches a system (see Monroe, fig. 21A) for processing information about an incident comprising:

a first wireless communication device (see Monroe, fig. 21A, component 300) including a first short-range transceiver (see Monroe, fig. 21C, component 350) to transmit a request signal (see Monroe, para. [0023], lines 3-7) including information about a designated location (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 9-10) and a first video

sensor to collect data relating to an incident event (see Monroe, fig. 21c, component 346) in response to a user activation input (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 17-27);

a second wireless communication device (see Monroe, fig. 21A, component 302) including a second short-range transceiver (see Monroe, fig. 21A, component 350) to receive the request signal (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 11-17) and a second video sensor to collect data relating to the incident event (see Monroe, fig. 21A, component 302) in response to the request signal (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 17-27), wherein the first wireless communication device coordinates collection of data with the second wireless communication device (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 11-17), and the second short-range transceiver transmits the collected data to the designated location (see Monroe, para [0021], lines 21-27); and

a central authority (see Monroe, fig. 3; "guard station #1") configured to receive the data collected by the first and second wireless communication devices relating to the incident event (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 21-27) and correlating incident information associated with the incident event (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 21-22) with the at least one portion of previously received information that relates to the incident information (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 24-25) in response to receiving that data (the response personnel correlates the live video information with audio information received from the caller or the archived audio/video).

Regarding **claim 18**, Monroe also teaches the system of claim 17, further comprising a local server having a third short-range transceiver (see Monroe, fig. 21A,

component 34) to receive the request signal (see Monroe, para. [0023], lines 3-7) and to gather the data collected by the first and second wireless communication devices (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 21-27), the local server configured to forward the gathered data to the central authority (see Monroe, para. [0221], lines 5-9).

Regarding **claim 19**, Monroe also teaches the system of claim 17, wherein the first wireless communication device includes a wireless transceiver to communicate the data collected by the first video sensor to the central authority (see Monroe, fig. 21C, component 350).

Regarding **claim 20**, Monroe also teaches the system of claim 17, wherein the second wireless communication device includes a wireless transceiver to communicate the data collected by the second video sensor to the central authority (see Monroe, fig. 21A, components 302 and 350).

Regarding **claim 22**, Monroe also teaches the system of claim 17, wherein the central authority determines whether other information sources are available (see Monroe, para. [0020], lines 10-14) and requests information from the other information sources that are available (see Monroe, para. [0020], lines 14-19).

Regarding **claim 23**, Monroe also teaches the system of claim 17, wherein the central authority reconstructs the incident event based on the data collected by at least the first and second video sensors (see Monroe, para. [0021], lines 21-27).

Regarding **claim 24**, Monroe also teaches the system of claim 17, wherein the central authority identifies other devices that may become affected by the incident event and alerts any devices that may become affected by the incident event (see Monroe, para. [0020], lines 14-19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Hanninen et al. (US. 7,058,409 B2; hereinafter "Hanninen")

Regarding **claim 21**, Monroe teaches the system of claim 17, wherein:

the second wireless communication device (see Monroe, fig. 23A, component 302) sends the data collected by the second video sensor to the first wireless

communication device (see Monroe, fig. 23A, component 300) via the first and second short-range transceivers (see Monroe, fig. 23A, components 350's).

Monroe is silent to teaching that wherein the first wireless communication device includes a wireless transceiver to communicate the data collected by the first and second video sensors to the central authority. However, Monroe teaches a wired transceiver (see Monroe, fig. 23A, component 333) instead of a wireless transceiver, to communicate the data collected by the first and second video sensors to the central authority (see Monroe, para. [0223]).

Hanninen teaches a system wherein the first wireless communication device (see Hanninen, fig. 1, component 120) includes a wireless transceiver to communicate the data collected by the second video sensor to the central authority (see Hanninen, col. 3, lines 37-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Monroe with the teaching of Hanninen in order to provide a useful record of crimes (see Hanninen, col. 1, lines 34-35).

3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanninen in view of Momosaki et al. (US. 6,993,354 B2; hereinafter "Momosaki")

Regarding **claim 1**, Hanninen teaches a method for a wireless communication device to provide information about an incident (see Hanninen, fig. 1, component 120, col. 1, lines 7-12), the method comprising:

detecting an activation input associated with an incident event (see Hanninen, col. 4, lines 45-50);

coordinating collection of data by the wireless communication device with the at least one remote device (see Hanninen, col. 3, lines 37-39 and 54-58);

recording data relating to the subject matter of the incident event (see Hanninen, col. 5, lines 8-11), the data being obtained by at least one video sensor of the at least one remote device (see Hanninen, fig. 1, component 110); and

transmitting the recorded data to a designated location (see Hanninen, col. 3, lines 12-15 and 37-40).

Hanninen is silent to teaching that comprising scanning for at least one remote device. However, Hanninen teaches that the transmission protocol between the wireless communication device and the at least one remote device is Bluetooth protocol. Therefore, the claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Momosaki.

Momosaki shows a method for Bluetooth transmission comprising scanning for at least one remote device (see Momosaki, col. 13, lines 12-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hanninen and the teaching of Momosaki in order to allow the wireless communication device and the at least one

remote device to be electrically connected to each other via Bluetooth (see Hanninen, col. 3, line 14).

Regarding **claim 2**, the combination of Hanninen and Momosaki also teaches the method of claim 1, wherein coordinating collection of data with the at least one remote device includes informing the at least one remote device about the designated location (see Momosaki, col. 13, lines 12-13; wherein the designation location is the wireless communication device).

Regarding **claim 3**, the combination of Hanninen and Momosaki also teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving authorization to utilize data obtained by the at least one remote device (see Hanninen, col. 4, lines 22-31 and col. 5, lines 4-8).

Regarding **claim 4**, the combination of Hanninen and Momosaki also teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising identifying subject matter of the incident event based on the activation input (see Hanninen, col. 4, lines 45-50).

Regarding **claim 5**, the combination of Hanninen and Momosaki also teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

retrieving previously recorded data relating to the subject matter of the incident event (see Hanninen, col. 3, lines 46-53); and

transmitting the previously recorded data to the designated location (see Hanninen, col. 3, lines 12-15 and 37-40; wherein the designated location is nearest mobile network base station 120).

Regarding **claim 6**, the combination of Hanninen and Momosaki also teaches the method of claim 1, wherein:

scanning for the at least one remote device including scanning via a wireless local area network (see Hanninen, col. 3, line 14); and

transmitting the recorded data to a designated location includes transmitting via a cellular communication system (see Hanninen, col. 3, lines 12-15 and 37-40; wherein the designated location is nearest mobile network base station 120).

Regarding **claim 7**, Hanninen teaches a method for a wireless communication device to provide information about an incident (see Hanninen, fig. 1, component 110, col. 3, lines 9-10), the method comprising:

detecting, from a remote device (see Hanninen, fig. 1, component 120), a request signal associated with an incident event (see Hanninen, col. 3, lines 57-58 and col. 4, lines 45-47);

recording data relating to the subject matter of the incident event (see Hanninen, col. 4, lines 61-62); and

transmitting the recorded data to the designated location (see Hanninen, col. 3, lines 12-15 and 37-40), the data being obtained by at least one video sensor (see Hanninen, col. 4, lines 61-62).

Hanninen is silent to teaching that comprising receiving information from the remote device about a designated location. However, Hanninen teaches that the transmission protocol between the wireless communication device and the at least one remote device is Bluetooth protocol. Therefore, the claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Momosaki.

Momosaki shows a method for Bluetooth transmission comprising receiving information from the remote device about a designated location (see Momosaki, col. 13, lines 6-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hanninen and the teaching of Momosaki in order to allow the wireless communication device and the at least one remote device to be electrically connected to each other via Bluetooth (see Hanninen, col. 3, line 14).

Regarding **claim 8**, the combination of Hanninen and Momosaki also teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising identifying subject matter of the incident event based on video characteristics received from the remote device (see Hanninen, col. 5, lines 8-11).

Regarding **claim 9**, the combination of Hanninen and Momosaki also teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising providing authorization to the remote device to utilize the recorded data (see Hanninen, col. 4, lines 22-31 and col. 5, lines 4-8).

Regarding **claim 10**, the combination of Hanninen and Momosaki also teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising:

identifying subject matter of the incident event based on the request signal (see Hanninen, col. 4, lines 45-50); and

requesting more information from the remote device if the subject matter cannot be clearly identified (see Hanninen, col. 5, lines 4-6).

Regarding **claim 11**, the combination of Hanninen and Momosaki also teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising:

retrieving previously recorded data relating to the subject matter of the incident event (see Hanninen, col. 3, lines 46-53); and

transmitting the previously recorded data to the designated location (see Hanninen, col. 3, lines 12-15 and 37-40; wherein the designated location is nearest mobile network base station 120).

Regarding **claim 12**, the combination of Hanninen and Momosaki also teaches the method of claim 7, wherein transmitting the recorded data to a designated location includes transmitting via a wireless communication system (see Hanninen, col. 3, lines

12-15 and 37-40; wherein the designated location is nearest mobile network base station 120).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 7, 13 and 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen W. Huang whose telephone number is (571) 272-7852. The examiner can normally be reached on 10am - 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay A. Maung can be reached on (571) 272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

wwh

6/23/06

NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER